

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 have been rejected. Claims 1 and 9 have been amended. Claims 3, 4, 11, 12, and 20-23 have been cancelled. No new matter has been added.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Rejections

Rejections of Claims 1-16

Claims 1-16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No 6,055,526 (Ambroziak). Claims 1-16 contains features that are neither taught nor suggested by the prior art of record. As illustrated by independent claim as amended:

A system for compression comprising:

a memory device that stores a plurality of compressed and uncompressed normalized index keys in sorted order, with no gaps between the stored normalized keys, and stores a plurality of slots with no gaps between the stored slots, wherein the memory device stores the plurality of compressed and uncompressed normalized index keys starting after a header and the plurality of normalized index keys grows towards the end of the memory device as additional index keys are added; and

a processor that compresses the stored normalized keys, wherein each slot corresponds to a normalized index key in the memory page and comprises a memory offset of the corresponding key and an indicator indicating if the corresponding normalized index key is compressed.

Ambroziak purports to teach a method for compressing an index to obtain a compressed index that can be easily stored and transmitted (Ambroziak, Abstract). An index is maintained for each document, allowing for easy updating of indexes in response to changes in documents and easy transmission of indexes (Id.) The system provides a compact index that is at the same time able to be processed rapidly (Id.).

Ambroziak fails to teach several of the features of independent claim 1, and therefore cannot possibly anticipate the claim. Specifically, Ambroziak fails to teach **an indicator indicating if the corresponding normalized index key is compressed**. This feature was originally found in now cancelled claim 4. In the rejection to this claim, the Examiner states that this feature is taught at column 13 lines 18-34. Applicants respectfully disagree. The

cited portion makes no mention of compressing normalized keys, let alone an indicator indicating that a key is compressed. The Examiner further states that “normalization is interpreted to be a geometric object is to transform it so that some function of its coordinates or other parameters has a pre-specified value and wherein a compression factor is defined” (Office Action, page 4). Applicants respectfully disagree with this statement, and submit that a normalized key is “a key that has been transformed to remove any difficulties related to the different types making up the key” (Specification, ¶ 7). The normalized key is not a “geometric object” and has neither coordinates nor a pre-specified value. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow claim 1.

Independent claim 9 contains similar features as independent claim 1, and is therefore allowable for the same reasons given for claim 1 above. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow claim 9.

Dependent claims 2, 5-8, 10, and 13-16 are all variously dependent on independent claims 1, and 9, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons given above for the independent claims. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections and allow claims 2, 5-8, 10, and 13-16.

Rejections of Claims 17-19

Claims 17-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ambroziak. Claims 17-19 contains features that are neither taught nor suggested by the prior art of record.

Independent claim 17 includes the feature of **comparing the first normalized index key with a second normalized index key preceding the first normalized index key in the memory page**. The Examiner states that Ambroziak teaches such a feature at column 17, lines 22-31. Applicants respectfully disagree. The cited portion of Ambroziak teaches the use of various tables to determine which C/P groups should be decompressed. There is simply no description whatsoever of a normalized index key, nor comparing a normalized index key with a normalized index key stored in memory.

The Examiner further states that this feature is taught at column 19, lines 52-67. Applicants again respectfully disagree. The cited portion describes retrieving compression Key 1 and a Key 2, using these keys to decompress corresponding C/P groups. This is not the same as **comparing the first normalized index key with a second normalized index**

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2832
Application No.: 10/748,569
Office Action Dated: December 7, 2006

**PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116**

key preceding the first normalized index key in the memory page. First, none of the described keys are normalized index keys. The keys described in the cited portion are decryption keys and are used solely to decrypt corresponding C/P groups. Normalized index keys have nothing to do with decompression whatsoever. Second, even if the keys were normalized index keys, they are never compared in the cited portion, rather it is the contents of the corresponding C/P groups that are compared.

Because Ambroziak fails to teach or suggest each element of claim 17, it cannot possibly anticipate it. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow claim 17.

Dependent claims 18 and 19 are all variously dependent on independent claim 17, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons given above for the independent claim. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections and allow claims 18 and 19.

Date: February 7, 2007

/Michael W. Tieff/
Michael W. Tieff
Registration No. 57,845

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439